DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 962 IR 054 309

AUTHOR Lent, John
TITLE Libraries and Librarians as Depicted in Freshmen English Textbooks: An Update.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 40p.; Master's Thesis, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *College English; College Freshmen; Content Analysis; Higher Education; Information Seeking; Librarians; *Library Automation; *Library Instruction; *Textbook Content; Textbook Evaluation; *User Needs (Information)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the treatment given to libraries, librarians, and library usage in freshman English textbooks. The study follows criteria established by Virginia Tiefel ("Libraries and Librarians as Depicted in Freshman English Textbooks," College English 44, September 1982) in a study of texts published between 1952 and 1980. Tiefel found that libraries and librarians were discussed in a way that was not helpful to readers and reflected few of the tenets of bibliographic instruction. She suggested that such texts could be improved by stressing the relevance and importance of library skills, by addressing the real needs of freshmen, by making the search strategy concept the foundation of the treatment, and by producing such treatments in conjunction with librarians. The present study of 25 freshman English texts published between 1980 and 1990 finds that, while improvements have occurred in certain areas, such as in the discussions of librarian's roles in helping users, in other areas there has been little change for the better. For example only a few texts provide annotations for reference works they list, only three provide detailed discussions of the search strategy concept, only seven explain that coverage of the catalog may vary from library to library, and only six acknowledge the input of librarians. Discussions of the role of technology in libraries--online catalogs, online databases and searching, and CD-ROMs--also vary in helpfulness. A list of the texts examined, a list of the number of library related pages in each book and the percentage these pages compared to the rest of the book, and a list of the number of libraries reported holding these books are appended. (Contains 5 references.) (Author/KRN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED352962

# LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS AS DEPICTED IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS: AN UPDATE

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

John Lent

October, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Lent

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

12054309



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Master's Research Paper by

John Lent

B.A., C.W. Post Center of Long Island University, 1976

M.A., Kent State University, 1978

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1991

Approved by

Adviser Greg Byerly Date 10/28/91

# LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS AS DEPICTED IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS: AN UPDATE


## ABSTRACT

In 1982, Virginia Tiefel found that in 25 freshman English texts published between 1952 and 1980, the discussions of libraries, librarians and library usage were, in general, not helpful to readers, and reflected little of the tenets of bibliographic instruction. She suggested that such texts could be improved by stressing the relevance and importance of library skills, by addressing the real needs of freshmen, by making the search strategy concept the foundation of the library chapter, and by producing such chapters in conjunction with librarians. The present study examines 25 freshman English texts published between 1980 and 1990, principally according to criteria established by Tiefel, and finds that while improvements have occurred in certain areas, such as in the discussions of librarians' roles in helping users, in other areas there has been little change for the better. For example, only a few texts provide annotations for reference works they list, only three provide detailed discussions of the search strategy concept, only seven explain that coverage of the catalog may vary from library to library, and only six acknowledge the input of librarians. Discussions of the role of technology in libraries--online catalogs, online databases and searching, and CD-ROMs--also vary in helpfulness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank my research paper adviser, Dr. Greg Byerly, for his help, and of course, Virginia Tiefel, for writing the original study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1
Review of the Literature . . . . . 2
Design of the Study . . . . . 3
Number of Texts . . . . . 5
NUMBER OF PAGES ON LIBRARIES . . . . . 6
LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS . . . . . 7
CARD CATALOG . . . . . 12
REFERENCE BOOKS . . . . . 15
PERIODICAL INDEXES . . . . . 17
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES . . . . . 19
CONCEPT OF SEARCH STRATEGY . . . . . 20
TECHNOLOGY IN LIBRARIES . . . . . 21
SUMMARY . . . . . 24
IMPROVEMENT . . . . . 26
APPENDICES . . . . . 29
Appendix A--List of Texts Examined . . . . . 29
Appendix B--Pages on Libraries . . . . . 31
Appendix C--Library Holdings . . . . . 32
ENDNOTES . . . . . 33
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 34

# LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS AS DEPICTED IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS:

# AN UPDATE

## INTRODUCTION

In 1982, Virginia Tiefel published a study which explored the treatment accorded to libraries and librarians in 25 freshman English textbooks published between 1952 and 1980. She found that, while many of these texts offered "overt praise of libraries," they were filled with "errors, omissions, incomplete explanations, and inappropriate emphases." Moreover, they reflected "little understanding of the librarian's real function and fail[ed] to recognize librarians as teachers." On the whole, she found that there was "little evidence in these books of the impact of library instruction."[1]

The significance of the shortcomings of these texts is that, for many students at many colleges and universities, it is during freshman English that they receive their first (and often only) formal bibliographic instruction in using an academic library. How critically important this instruction is may be illustrated by the results of a 1986 survey in which 44 academic libraries in the state of Washington participated. As part of the study, librarians were asked to indicate "which basic library skills/competencies were most important, in their opinion, and to estimate

which of these skills 'average entering' students possessed." Among these skills/competencies were the abilities to understand the concept of an index, to interpret the information given in a periodical index citation or a bibliographic record, to develop a search strategy, to use the card catalog, and to evaluate information. Of 14 skills or competencies listed, the librarians surveyed estimated that only 50% of incoming students could perform five.[2] (References to specific skill assessments will be made at appropriate places throughout.)

Given the rather dismal findings of the Washington state study, logic seems to dictate that the texts students may use in freshman English should provide a helpful, corroborative supplement to what they may be taught about library usage by librarians.

But, as indicated, Tiefel found that, by and large, these texts were not helpful, and she suggested that writers of freshman English texts make significant revisions in their sections on libraries. This study sought to determine how a sampling of 25 freshman English texts published between 1980 and 1990 compare in their treatment of the subject to those Tiefel examined. In addition, it also examines what information these texts provide their readers concerning the use of technology (online catalogs, online databases, and cd-roms, in particular) in libraries.

## Review of the Literature

To determine if any similar updates of Tiefel's study had been undertaken, the following indexes were searched: *Library Literature*, January 1982-June 1991; *LISA*, 1982-May 1991; *ERIC*, 1983-June 1991; *Education Index*, July 1981-June 1991; and *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*, 1982-August 1991.

Although the literature is rife with articles on bibliographic

instruction, very few deal directly or comprehensively with the issue of freshman English texts. Karen Greenberg and Paula Clark, however, do point out, in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, that "many basic course textbooks offer little or no assistance to the student reader trying to do research in an academic library."[3]

This search did uncover one study similar to Tiefel's, Dan Reas's "Library Skills Instruction Found in Freshman English Textbooks at the University of Tennessee." However, his study does not replicate the scope and depth of iefel's. It is limited to a discussion of those freshman English texts required or recommended for use at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (some 20 in all, only five containing sections on library use or instruction). Using some of Tiefel's criteria, he arrived at the same general conclusion: "The library sections of freshman English textbooks . . . are in great need of improvement."[4]

## Design of the Study

This study in large part replicates Tiefel's study. Using many of her criteria, it examines the discussion of libraries, librarians, and the use of libraries in a sampling of 25 freshman English textbooks published between 1980 (the cutoff date of Tiefel's study) and 1990. Although later editions of several of the texts Tiefel examined are included in this study, no attempt has been made to provide detailed comparisons of the changes--or lack of changes--an individual text may have gone through; Tiefel's study does not provide the kind of data which would allow such comparisons to be undertaken.

Furthermore, Tiefel does not define what she means by "freshman English textbook." A look at the Appendix in which she lists the texts she examined strongly suggests the titles included are intended to be rhetorics, at least

in part. However, she initially looked at 80 texts, 55 of which did not have sections on libraries. This, of course, does not mean that those other 55 texts were also rhetorics. Some may have been readers or collections of essays, some may have been literary anthologies.

For the purposes of the present study, a freshman English text is considered to be any text whose design indicates it is intended to be (or could be used as) a rhetoric on the community college, junior college, college, or university level. Readers, collections of essays, literary anthologies, and specialized writing-of-research-papers texts are not included. However, texts which are combined reader-rhetorics and texts designated as handbooks which can be (and frequently are) employed as rhetorics have been included.

Twenty-five texts have been selected from those listed in the online catalog (CATALYST) of the Kent State University Library under the subject heading ENGLISH LANGUAGE--RHETORICS, from copies owned by the researcher and various members of the English Department at Kent State University, from examination copies sent by publishers to the English Department of Kent State University, and from copies in the collection of the English Department's Writing Center. In addition, 15 of the texts included in the study have gone through multiple editions (a few as many as ten or more), which further suggests many of them are being (or have been) used in classrooms. (When texts have appeared in multiple editions, the latest edition has been referred to whenever possible.) Many of these texts have also been (or are being) used or considered for use at Kent State University. Finally, OCLC was consulted in an attempt to determine how many libraries report owning copies of an individual text; this can provide some additional indication of a text's potential use as a college rhetoric. (At the low end, as of

December 15, 1990, 13 libraries reported holding copies of the 2nd edition of Kennedy's The Bedford Guide for College Writers; at the high end, 466 reported holding copies of Lunsford's The St. Martin's Handbook. See Appendix C for a full list of titles and holdings.)

For each title included in the study, the following aspects of its discussion on library usage were analyzed. One through three essentially replicate aspects of Tiefel's study.

1. Number of pages devoted to the discussion of libraries, librarians, and library usage and the percentage of these pages to the total book. (The total book will include all numbered pages, including indexes. Pages devoted to libraries will include only those that focus on using the library; not included will be pages devoted to planning and writing research papers, taking notes, composing bibliographies, etc.)

2. How, in general, libraries and librarians are depicted in these pages.

3. What these texts have to say about five major areas related to effective library usage:
   A. The card catalog
   B. Reference books
   C. Periodical indexes
   D. The differentiation between primary and secondary sources
   E. The concept of "search strategy"

4. What information, if any, they convey about the uses of technology (online catalogs, online search services, and cd-roms) in libraries, an area to which Tiefel's study did not devote much attention.

**Number of Texts**

Tiefel originally examined 80 freshman English textbooks published between 1952 and 1980. Of those 80 texts, only 25 contained sections on libraries--less than a third specifically 31.25%.

In the present study, all 25 texts contained sections on libraries. But since Tiefel does not define what she means by "freshman English text," there is no valid means of discussing the significance of these figures.

## NUMBER OF PAGES ON LIBRARIES

The number of pages devoted to discussion of libraries in the texts Tiefel examined ranged from a low of 2 to a high of 47; the average length was 11.56 pages. Expressed as a percentage of the total pages in the book, sections on libraries ranged from .5% to 8.3%. She found no correlation between publication date and length of the library section; however, she did suggest that the length of the section on libraries "may be a predictor of the quality of the treatment" because "longer sections at least . . . provide a better opportunity to cover the needed information" (487).

The sections on libraries in the texts in for the present study range from Bridges' one page to Tibbetts' 32 pages (his section on libraries, however, does contain about 11 pages on note-taking, documentation, etc., which are interspersed throughout the library section). The average length is 12.48 pages. The percentage of the pages on libraries to the total pages of the book range from .25% (Bridges) to 8.0% (Parker). Again, no correlation between publication date and length of section was found.

Any attempts at comparison, however, may be invalid. Tiefel did not indicate what she included in total pages (indexes, etc.), nor did she indicate what she considered--or did not consider--as constituting part of the library section. This study did not include, for example, pages devoted to note-taking skills, formats for notes and bibliographies, or the actual writing of the research paper.

For the texts in the present study, the effectiveness of length as a barometer for quality of treatment may be suspect (although, as Tiefel herself pointed out, it is difficult to generalize from so few examples). One of the longer sections on libraries appears in Winkler and McKuen's *Rhetoric Made Plain* (20 pages); however, it achieves its length principally

through a 14-page-long list of reference sources, leaving little space for discussion of other aspects of library usage. (It also contains several notable errors or omissions which are referred to later.) Appendix II lists titles, number of pages, and percentage of pages discussing libraries in proportion to total number of pages of all the texts in this study.

## LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS

In her study, Tiefel found that although all the texts she examined, "in some way, indicate a respect for libraries, many send conflicting signals about their use." Often, they served to intimidate prospective users by labeling the library as a "maze" or "museum" or "labyrinth"; one unidentified text informed its readers that "the whole topic is grim" (495). Overall, she found these attitudes had undergone no basic change since the early 1950s, when the first of the texts she investigated were published.

In the texts examined in the present study, for the most part references to libraries *per se* are noncommital and brief, although sometimes similar conflicting signals are sent. In Brown and Burnette's *Connections*, the library is referred to as a "great treasure chest of information"; however, its "seemingless endless rows of books and [its] complicated filing systems are intimidating."[5] In Crews and Schor's *Borzoi Handbook for Writers*, the library is described as being "mysterious . . . even vaguely threatening" (445); in Tibbetts' *Strategies of Rhetoric* it's called a "maze" (361), which, Kennedy informs his readers, is filled with "those dry old fossils, books" (*The Bedford Guide for College Writers*, 397). (If Kennedy's statement is meant to be ironic or in jest, the humor may be lost on many freshmen.)

In a more positive vein, Horner's *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition* promotes the library as being the "academic heart of a university," a

"treasure house of information" containing "the accumulated knowledge of centuries, the memory of your culture" (348, 339). And rather than conveying the impression that a library is a fathomless maze, Gould's *Reading into Writing* states that "all college libraries are designed for reference and research" (591). So, too, does Hodges' *Harbrace College Handbook*, which states that "college and university libraries are organized to make research as efficient as possible" (408). (Granted, some libraries may be better organized than others.) In *Writing with Style*, Fergensen tries to persuade her readers that it is not only educational, but even fun "to browse through the reference section of your library just to see what it contains" (281).

Recognizing that not all libraries are arranged similarly, many texts urge students to become familiar with the workings and organization of their own campus library; Langan's *English Skills*, for example, offers commonly echoed advice: "the more familiar you are with the library, the more effectively you will be able to use it" (231). Ten texts also suggest finding out about and taking orientation or other library tours, if these are available. A few, like Kennedy, even suggest using public or other nearby libraries to augment the college or university library. And sixteen provide some type of exercise to assist teachers in encouraging students to become more familiar with the library. These range from simple source-finding exercises to full-scale research projects.

Librarians generally fared poorly in the texts Tiefel examined. What she discovered was a basic lack of understanding of the role of librarians in education. Although several of the texts included glowing comments on librarians, and they were frequently described as being "knowledgeable" and "helpful," she found that "the help described is usually of the most elementary kind. The overall impression . . . is that librarians are service

people only, not teachers in their own right." She also found that a significant number of texts (identified only as "fewer than half") failed to mention librarians at all (495-496). The need to impress upon freshmen students the role the librarian can play in helping them develop effective library skills is indicated in studies like that conducted by Colleen Amundson, who found that librarians were the least used source by freshmen doing term papers.[8]

Of the texts examined here, only two (Robey's *New Handbook of Basic Writing Skills* and Dornan's *Brief English Handbook*) never mention consulting a librarian for help, even of the most rudimentary kind. One (Winkler's *Rhetoric*) only mentions the librarian in the context of an orientation tour. Every other text does suggest, even if it does little else, consulting reference librarians when using the library; however, they do so in varying degrees of emphasis, some urging the student to consult a librarian at almost every turn, some only in connection with specific concerns, such as the feasibility of using interlibrary loan or conducting an online search.

Horner invests librarians with the traditional role of gatekeeper: She tells her readers librarians "are there to unlock the door" to the "treasure house of information." She also urges her readers not only to "get to know your librarians" but, "above all, [to] appreciate them" (349-350). Librarians everywhere may be thankful for Lunsford's recommendation in *The St. Martin's Handbook* that to "get the most helpful advice, . . . pose *specific* questions"; the student unable to do so, she counsels, needs to do more general background research before seeking a librarian's help (534-535). Both Tibbetts' *Strategies of Rhetoric* and Kane's *The Oxford Guide to Writing* also stress developing a modicum of self-sufficiency in using the library. Tibbetts says, "before asking a librarian for assistance, be sure you have

followed all the leads you know about" (370). Kane puts it more bluntly: when looking for material, he admonishes, don't "dump the whole task onto the librarian"; he advises instead learning one's way around the library before seeking help (523).

Only a few texts convey the impression that librarians are professionals or teachers in their own right. Kennedy describes the reference librarian as a "learned specialist" (398). Two texts, Leggett's *Prentice Hall Handbook* and Watkins's *Practical English Handbook*, indicate not only the faculty status many academic librarians enjoy but also acknowledge the role librarians play in educating students. Leggett describes reference librarians as "teachers trained to show you effective ways of using the library" (442), while Watkins informs his readers "your professors in [library research] are the reference librarians, indispensible professionals in any college or university library" (332). And, in acknowledging the assistance of the Reference Department of Emory University's Woodruff Library in preparing his section on library usage, Watkins also states that "members of that exceptional staff have taught us much, and they continue to be our partners in the teaching of our students" (xix).

However, the attitude conveyed in many of these texts seems to be similar to that expressed in many of the texts Tiefel examined. In *The Independent Writer*, Parker labels the librarian "your most important resource" (480). In *Writing: Discovering Form and Meaning*, Bridges tells his readers that the reference librarian is a "valuable source of information . . . whose job it is to help people find what they are looking for" (228). *The St. Martin's Handbook* informs readers that "your most valuable source at the library is the highly trained staff, especially the reference librarians" (534). As Tiefel found, although their services and abilities are generally presented

positively, there still "appears to be little understanding of the role of librarians in educating students" (496). The attitude most purvey is that a librarian is a helpful reference tool whose principal function is to point the way to other reference tools.

A few texts do at least imply that librarians are human and not information-providing automatons, that the services they can (or are willing) to provide and their abilities to do so may vary. Fergensen states that the reference librarian is "*usually* able to answer questions and help you locate material" (281), while Glorfeld's *A Concise Guide for Writers* states that "your librarian *may be* willing to help you learn to use" the card catalog or periodical indexes (174). Parker asserts that "*most* librarians have a knowledge of and a love for their collections and are only too glad to encourage you to get to know the contents of the library," but he may alarm some already overworked or harried librarians with the following vaguely worded suggestion he makes to his readers: "If you have not already done so, make yourself known to your local librarians" (460). (My italics in each of the three preceding quotations.)

Although precise comparisons are difficult to make on this point, overall, the images of libraries and librarians these texts convey seems to be less negative than those in Tiefel's study. Fewer texts send conflicting signals about libraries (although, at the same time, only a few send out positive signals), and all but three do urge students to consult librarians for help. Even though the kind of help that many texts suggest librarians can offer is still often of a rudimentary or mechanical kind, and even though few texts suggest that librarians are educators in their own right, most do at least convey to their readers that librarians can provide valuable help in learning to use the resources of the library effectively--which is, perhaps, the most

important point to get across to freshmen (and other library users).

**CARD CATALOG**

Of the 25 texts Tiefel examined, 18 described types of cards in card catalogs (author, title, subject); 15 explained the elements that appear on the cards; and 13 provided some explanation of Library of Congress and Dewey classification systems. Only seven discussed the significance of the call number, and only one stressed the importance of recording it completely and correctly. Six provided partial explanation of rules used in filing cards; four described the concept of cross references. Seven defined tracings, but only one described how they may be used. Only two described *Library of Congress Subject Headings*; only one provided an example to illustrate its importance and use.

She found a number of texts were misleading about coverage of the card catalog, and suggested that more texts should emphasize that card catalogs may vary in the kinds of materials they include. Overall, her assessment was that the majority of texts gave too much emphasis to the card catalog, to the types and parts of cards, and to classification systems "because many will have had earlier experiences with catalog cards" (498). She suggested more emphasis be given to stressing the importance of copying call numbers completely and correctly, to using *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, to the use of tracings, and to cross references.

The Washington state study sends mixed signals about freshmen's ability to use the card catalog. Of the librarians surveyed, 93% felt that the ability to use library catalogs to find materials by author, title, or subject was important; they believed 80% of incoming students had this ability--the highest confidence rating of the 14 skills/competencies on the survey. On

the other hand, 82% of the librarians felt the ability to interpret the information in a bibliographic record was also important, but they believed only 23% of incoming students had this ability. As for call numbers, 91% of the librarians believed the ability to understand them was important; they felt only 57% of incoming freshmen could do so.[7]

Every text examined in the present study at least refers to the card catalog, and somewhere in their library sections, 18 point out that a specific library's catalog may be in a form other than the traditional card catalog. Dornan and Robey mention microfiche, book, and COM catalogs; the others refer to online catalogs.

Heavy emphasis on the card catalog and on the types and parts of catalog cards continues. Of the 25 texts, 21 provide illustrations of typical catalog cards: 19 provide illustrations of author, title, and subject cards, while Hodges provides an author card illustration, Robey a subject card; both mention other types of cards. Horner also provides a series card. Seventeen of these texts offer at least partial explanation of card elements; an 18th, Gould, directs the reader to "learn to interpret the information" on the card (591).

Seventeen texts point out the significance of the call number, a noticeable improvement over the seven in Tiefel's study; so too were the eight which stress recording it completely and correctly. Among these are Watkins, who warns that "carelessness in jotting down call numbers can lead to wasted time and confusion" and advises students to "double check" them (349).

Only five texts explain cross references (one, Crews and Schor's *The Borzoi Handbook for Writers*, does so only for *Library of Congress Subject Headings*) while two others mention the term. Tracings are defined by 15

texts; however, eight of these texts do not use the term but refer to this area of the card with a term such as "subject headings." One text (Lunsford) identifies tracings, but offers no explanation of their purpose or potential use. Only seven texts indicate that tracings can be used to find additional materials on the subject under investigation. Winkler, who refers readers to examine tracings on sample catalog cards which, unfortunately, contain no tracings, also explains the CIP (Cataloging in Publication) data on a book's copyright page and suggests using this information as the source of useful subject headings and other information (200).

Fewer texts (six) provide some explanation of the Library of Congress and Dewey classification systems. Four others briefly mention Library of Congress, while three of these four also mention Dewey.

Twelve texts describe the *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, although one, Glorfeld, does not refer to it by title. Leggett also mentions *Sears*. However, only four texts (Kennedy, Crews, McCrimmon's *Writing with a Purpose*, D'Angelo's *Process and Thought in Composition*) provide an example to illustrate *LCSH*'s use and importance. Only one text--Horner--briefly discusses filing rules; perhaps the proliferation of online catalogs has led to the perception that there is less need for such explanations.

Of the texts examined here, only seven follow Tiefel's suggestion that they explain that coverage of the card catalog may vary according to a specific library's policy. Ten state or strongly imply coverage is limited to books; eight others state or strongly imply coverage includes books and other materials (periodicals, for the most part). Hodges makes a misleading statement in describing the catalog's coverage as "all books owned by the college or university" (408-409).

## REFERENCE BOOKS

Tiefel found a wide variation in how reference materials were described. Only two texts advised, as she indicated most librarians do, that the reference section is the best place to start an assignment. Many texts listed as few as six reference works; seven provided no annotations, which she considered "essential because it is a rare student who will learn how to use new material with no guidance" (498).

Of the types of reference works, most listed special subject encyclopedias, dictionaries, book review indexes, and biographical indexes. Bibliographies were discussed by only four authors, which she concludes is a "serious gap" because of their value as research tools (498). Winchell's *Guide to Reference Books* was cited by six; Sheehy's edition of *Guide to Reference Works*, Walford's *Guide to Reference Materials*, Mudge, and Gates each were cited once. Some texts did cover the importance of evaluating materials; only two did so in any depth.

Librarians in the Washington state study believed that 61% of incoming students were competent in using basic reference sources such as subject dictionaries, encyclopedias, almanacs, etc.; 84% of them considered this an important ability.[8]

Of the texts in the present study, eight explicitly state and six strongly suggest that the reference section is the best place to start most research.

Lack of reference sources cited (as indicated, in some texts, as few as six) was one of Tiefel's implied criticisms of the texts she examined. Of the 19 texts in the present study that list reference works, brevity is not a common problem. (Bridges, Parker, Brown, Robey, D'Angelo, and Langan listed no reference works.) Five listed between 10 and 25 (Glorfeld had 10); seven between 26 and 50; two between 51 and 75; one between 76 and 100; two between

101 and 150; and two listed 150 or more (Kane deluged his readers with more than 250 titles). However, only seven of these texts provide any annotations, and often only for a few of the works included. Six other texts do offer at least partial arrangement by subject matter or by type of reference work.

The most commonly cited types of reference works were similar to those in Tiefel's study. General encyclopedias were listed by 18 texts; subject encyclopedias by 17; dictionaries, biographical indexes, and almanacs by 15; book review indexes and bibliographies by 14; handbooks by 10; and atlases and/or gazetteers by seven.

The value of bibliographies as sources of information is again often overlooked. Of the 14 texts that include bibliographies in their list of reference works, only six stress their value as research tools. McCrimmon devotes a full page to the discussion, citing the advantages and disadvantages of using bibliographies, as well as means of locating them.

Eleven texts cite guides to reference works, while a twelfth, Bridges, acknowledges their existence but offers no examples. Sheehy is cited by nine (McCrimmon, however, misspells his name as Sheehan). Walford is cited by two, *American Reference Books Annual* (ARBA) by one. Winkler lists Winchell's rather dated 1951 edition. Fergensen cites Kister's *Best Encyclopedias* as well as specialized guides to educational, art, and business sources.

Fifteen texts discuss in varying degrees of coverage the importance of evaluating materials. Lauer's *Four Worlds of Writing*, for example, indicates that evaluation of sources is important, but provides no further hints or guidelines; McCrimmon devotes three pages (plus an evaluation exercise) to the subject. However, all these texts focus on the evaluation of research sources in general rather than on the evaluation of reference sources per

se. Regardless of their focus, though, coverage of evaluation techniques and criteria should, Tiefel pointed out, enable "students to get better information and [help] them to develop judgment and independent thinking" (498).

Sixty-eight percent of the librarians in the Washington state survey felt the ability to evaluate information was important, yet they felt only 14% of entering freshmen could do so.[8]

## PERIODICAL INDEXES

Tiefel found that 11 texts briefly described different types of periodical indexes; 12 covered the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* in some detail despite her contention "that many, if not most, freshmen are quite familiar with" it but not with other periodical indexes. Although 20 texts listed specific indexes, just six provided annotations. Only six explained citations, only two explained cross references, and only one "cover[ed] the important topic of how indexes may vary" (499).

Little guidance in the selection and use of periodical indexes was provided. Three described the *Ayer (Gale) Directory of Publications*, two described *Ulrich's*, one the *Union List of Serials*; none mentioned what she identified as "two more useful tools for freshmen," Katz' *Magazines for Libraries* and Farber's *Classified List of Periodicals for the College Library* (499). The key role of evaluation of periodicals and periodical indexes was ignored by most texts.

All 25 texts in the present study, at the very least, briefly discuss the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* as a source for journal and magazine articles, while 18 do so in some detail. On occasion, this coverage may be misleading; for example, Winkler states that the *Readers' Guide* is "an index

to most magazine articles published since 1923" (203). Twenty-three texts (all but Brown and Bridges) introduce the reader to other indexes in varying numbers. Parker lists a low of two, D'Angelo a high of 36. Of the twenty-three that do include other indexes, six list between 2 and 10, five between 11 and 20, eight between 21 and 30, and four between 31 and 36. However, only eleven provide annotations of any sort; only a few (Crews, Lauer, Kane, Leggett) provide annotations for most of the indexes they list. These annotations may be as brief as simply listing dates of coverage (Perrin), although most others do provide at least some indication of subject coverage.

Sixteen provide explanations of citations, all but Crews doing so for the *Readers' Guide*. Crews explains a citation from *Book Review Digest*; in addition to the citation for the *Readers' Guide*, Perrin explains one for *Education Index*, Dornan and Hodges for the *New York Times Index*, Kane for *Air Index*. Six texts explain cross references, while a seventh (McCrimmon) mentions their existence. The need for explanation of citation format is underscored by the Washington state survey; while 89% of the librarians surveyed felt the ability to interpret the information in a periodical index citation was important, they estimated only 39% of new incoming students possessed this skill.[10]

Only seven texts indicate that indexes may vary in coverage and/or format. Lunsford suggests "checking the beginning of the volume for an explanation of what it includes" (534); Tibbetts states that "most periodical indexes contain roughly the same format" but advises reading the introductory directions for use of specific indexes (368).

As for selection and use of periodical indexes, again, little guidance is provided. The *Ayer Directory* is described in one text. *Union List of Serials*

in three, *Ulrich's* in two. The two tools Tiefel suggested as being more useful to freshmen, Katz' *Magazines for Libraries* and Farber's *Classified List of Periodicals for the College Library*, are discussed in only three and one texts, respectively (Leggett lists both, while Gould and D'Angelo mention Katz). Only two (Perrin and Leggett) approach the topic of evaluation. However, five texts do suggest consulting a librarian for help in selection and use of periodicals and periodical indexes. And only six texts explicitly advise the reader to check the library's serials list or catalog to determine whether its collection contains a specific periodical.

**PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES**

Tiefel found the "very important differentiation" between primary and secondary sources covered in only six texts; this she considered to be "a serious omission because students should learn to distinguish between types of resources early in their academic careers and know which are most appropriate for their needs" (499). The Washington state survey revealed that 57% of the librarians considered the ability to distinguish between primary and secondary sources important, but they estimated that only 7% of entering freshmen could do so. In addition, 57% believed the ability to distinguish between scholarly and popular literature was important, but felt only 5% of incoming students had this ability--the lowest confidence rating of the 14 skills.[11]

Of the 25 texts examined here, 14 discuss the difference between primary and secondary sources. (In a number of these texts, the discussion was not within the pages expressly devoted to libraries and library usage.) McCrimmon, Watkins, and Leggett, in particular, offer clear and extended discussions of types of sources, their significance, and use. At the other

end of the spectrum, two texts, D'Angelo's and Parker's, present confusing or misleading definitions. Parker states that a secondary source is "a reference book" (461). D'Angelo, in his discussion of the use of the *Readers' Guide*, states that "popular magazines like *Newsweek, Redbook, Psychology Today* . . . get their material from another source, called a 'primary source.' . . . When you use only magazines listed in the *Readers' Guide*, you run the risk of quoting your material solely from what we call 'secondary sources'" (416).

## CONCEPT OF SEARCH STRATEGY

Fourteen of the texts Tiefel examined said nothing about the importance of using any kind of organized approach to doing research in the library. Six suggested starting with an encyclopedia; four went further with such suggestions as "use the bibliography of [an] article; break the topic down by use of an encyclopedia; consult a dictionary or thesaurus. Two recommend[ed] starting in the reference room; one suggest[ed] that the student copy titles from the card catalog and establish and follow a routine for gathering information" (499).

No book referred to a "search strategy" as such, and the 11 that did mention a process described only part of the needed procedure. Tiefel found this omission in the later texts in her study "difficult to understand inasmuch as this concept is so important and its teaching by librarians so widespread . . . since the early 1970s" (499).

Most of the texts examined here do convey to their readers that some kind of strategy is necessary for effective research; only four (Langan, Bridges, Robey, Brown) don't discuss the topic. Twelve suggest starting with an encyclopedia; eight offer further suggestions. Ten indicate that the

reference room or section of the library is generally the best place to start research. Four others suggest starting a search at a subject catalog. D'Angelo, in an extended illustration of a sample search, suggests beginning with *Library of Congress Subject Headings.*

Only four texts--Watkins, McCrimmon, Tibbetts, Leggett--refer explicitly to the concept of a search strategy; all but Watkins describe the full process. (Watkins does, however, stress the importance of planning a search strategy to avoid wasting "countless hours in random and fruitless excursions" [332].) Tibbetts devotes about seven pages to the process. Leggett begins his chapter by stressing the importance of having a search strategy, then follows a "typical" student through the process. McCrimmon presents a schematic diagram of the recommended search strategy, and the rest of the library section is presented following the order of the diagram.

Seventy percent of the Washington state librarians surveyed believed it was important that entering students be able to develop an effective search strategy using library resources; however, they estimated that only 7% could do so.[12]

## TECHNOLOGY IN LIBRARIES

Since many of the texts she examined were published prior to the widespread implementation and use (or at least the planning and discussion of use) of technology in libraries, Tiefel devoted minimal attention to the coverage of this topic. However, one would expect that for texts published after 1981, there would be considerably more about it.

In a number of instances, however, this is not the case. Eight texts (all published between 1981-1985) contain nothing about the possible uses of technology in libraries. Of those that do discuss the subject, 15 cover

online catalogs, 14 cover online database searching, while only four cover CD-ROMs.

The discussion of online catalogs ranges from a brief mention of their existence in seven texts to some detailed discussion (about one-half page) in three texts to an extended discussion (one page or more) in five texts. Hodges offers a particularly detailed discussion; he advises the reader to check with a librarian to ascertain if the online catalog contains all items; describes the enhanced number of access points an online catalog may provide; presents a sample catalog record; and warns that libraries may use different systems, "so expect to encounter variations on this example" (409-410). Horner offers similar advice, and adds a note of warning that some online catalogs "are fairly easy to operate" while "others are more complicated and require special knowledge" (285). Horner also indicates (as do a few others) that online catalogs "are more powerful than card catalogs" in their potential for providing more access points (she mentions call number, series, Boolean, and key word searching), but she also cautions that many online catalogs may not be complete because a library "may be slow in putting all [its] holdings in the database" due to the expense involved (351).

Four texts briefly mention online databases and/or searching; three devote about a half page or so to the subject; seven provide extended discussions of a page or more. Of the 10 texts that do more than briefly mention the subject, all but Horner explicitly state that either a librarian's help or advice should be sought before considering performing an online search. Both Lannon and O'Hare devote three pages to the subject and offer fairly detailed coverage. Lannon briefly discusses how information is stored, "runs" a sample search on the BRS system and provides sample readouts, then points out both the advantages and disadvantages of online searching--including, of

course, the potential cost. He concludes by suggesting the reader investigate what his or her library has to offer. O'Hare's discussion includes comments about descriptors and thesauri, presents advice on planning a search strategy, and provides two sample searches by way of illustration.

Many librarians (and English instructors) may argue that online searching is inappropriate or unnecessary for the typical freshman's research needs, and that such extended discussions may be unwarranted. Several authors acknowledge the validity of these objections but also justify including such topics. Crews provides this advice for freshmen (as well as for many others): "On the whole, then, for the purposes of a college essay it is better to do your searching in printed sources. But at least you know that on-line searching is available if you should need it. A reference librarian can tell you whether your project is one that lends itself readily to a computer search" (458). And Horner states that "technology has made all kinds of information available to the researcher . . . . Search facilities are proliferating as technology improves. The modern student needs to know how to use these search systems and computer terminals to access this body of knowledge" (339). Lannon informs his readers that "any familiarity you can develop with this new information technology will be a real asset--whatever your career plans" (373).

Only four texts provide any information on CD-ROMs. Horner mentions InfoTrac, and both Watkins and Hodges mention the availability of *Readers' Guide* on disk. Kennedy provides a paragraph which mentions the availability on CD-ROM of such databases as ERIC, PsychINFO, InfoTrac, and Magazine Index, offers a few comments on the advantages and disadvantages of CD-ROMs, and concludes by advising, "When in doubt about the best available database for your purpose, consult your reference librarian" (415).

**SUMMARY**

The following represent some of the more significant--and more easily measurable--comparisons between the findings of Tiefel's study and those of the present one.

Most texts examined in both studies devote quite a bit of their discussion of library usage to the card catalog and to types of catalog cards, which Tiefel objected to on the grounds that many students will have had prior experience with them. But the findings of the Washington state survey suggest that over 75% of incoming students may not fully understand the elements on a catalog card--or in an online bibliographic record. Therefore, it seems, some coverage remains necessary. But aspects of these topics may, of course, be rendered less important as computerized catalogs proliferate; for example, separate illustrations of author, title, and subject cards (which many texts provide) would no longer be necessary. Because of the increased importance of subject headings in searching online catalogs, perhaps more discussion of *Library of Congress Subject Headings* or other controlled vocabularies and how to use them might be more beneficial. Twelve texts do describe *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (ten more than in Teifel's group); four provide an example to illustrate its use and importance (Tiefel found only one).

Explanations of the kinds of materials the catalog may include are, as in Tiefel's study, sometimes misleading because rarely do they indicate local differences.

More texts (17) indicate the significance of the call number than in Tiefel's study (seven). Eight stress recording the call number completely and correctly; Tiefel's study found only one that did so.

Tracings were defined in 15 texts (seven in Tiefel's study); she found

only one text explaining how they may be used, while seven published between 1980 and 1990 did so.

Many of the texts she examined listed as few as six reference works; in the present study, most texts provided more than 25. However, how useful a list of over 100 sources with no annotations or indication of coverage would be is debatable. Only seven texts provided annotations for at least some of the reference works they listed; another six do arrange some by subject, discipline, or reference book type.

In both groups of texts, the same types of reference works--subject encyclopedias, dictionaries, book review indexes, biographical indexes--appeared most frequently. Tiefel found four texts that discussed the value of bibliographies as research tools; in the present study, six texts discussed their value and use in some detail while another six mentioned or listed them.

Only two texts in Tiefel's study discussed in depth the importance of evaluating materials. Fifteen of the texts in this study offered fairly detailed advice on evaluation of materials.

While Tiefel does not indicate how many texts mentioned the *Readers' Guide*, she does indicate that 12 of them discussed it in detail. All 25 texts examined here mentioned the *Readers' Guide*; 18 of them discussed it in detail.

Eleven texts in Tiefel's study listed other indexes; 23 texts did so here. Only six in her study provided annotations; 11 do so in the present study. Six explained citations, two cross references; 16 examined here explained citations, six cross references. She found only one text explaining how indexes may vary. Seven in the present study provide some discussion of this point.

Only a few texts in Tiefel's study offered guidance in the selection and use of periodicals and/or periodical indexes, while most ignored evaluation. In the present study, most texts also ignored these topics, although five at least suggest consulting a librarian for help in selecting and using indexes.

Tiefel found only six texts pointing out the difference between primary and secondary sources; fourteen of the texts published after 1980 do so.

Fourteen texts in her study said nothing about the importance of using any kind of organized approach to using the library; only four texts in this study were silent on this point. Although all of the other texts offered some kind of advice about formulating a search strategy, only four texts used the term "search strategy"; of these, only three described the process.

**IMPROVEMENT**

At the end of her article, Tiefel suggested that writers of freshman English texts follow three general guidelines for improving the content of their sections on libraries:

1. Students must understand why knowledge of libraries and the acquisition of library skills are important to them and relevant to their present and future needs.

2. Writers of such texts should remember that the text is written for freshmen, so the chapter should reflect the real needs of freshmen.

3. The search strategy concept should be made the foundation of the library chapter.

She also hoped that "such library chapters . . . will appear in future textbooks" (503). But few of the texts investigated here achieve her goals.

Her third major suggestion, to make the search strategy concept the foundation of the library section, remains generally unrealized. As indicated, it forms an integral part of the library sections in only three texts (McCrimmon, Tibbetts, and Leggett).

Sixteen texts do make some kind of an attempt to inform their freshman readers of the importance of effective library skills for their present and future needs. Most, however, concentrate on present needs--primarily on the student's need to write research papers for English and/or other courses. Only a few take the discussion beyond the classroom, with varying emphases. Watkins states that "research is necessary for you to know what you are talking about" (328), D'Angelo that it can provide "you with fresh material for conversation" (409). Kennedy indicates that learning how to use a library effectively can provide one with skills "essential not only in an academic community but in business and the professions" (344). Lunsford offers "news reporting, police detection, and law" as examples of professions which "rely heavily on research" (515). Glorfeld attempts to persuade his readers that "doing research is a prestigious activity" and that "people who do this work efficiently--professional researchers--are usually paid quite well for it" (172).

Tiefel's second suggested guideline revolves around her contention that "only material that has relevance for freshmen should be included." To that end, she suggests, because the American Library Association Interlibrary Lending Code proscribes the use of interlibrary loan for undergraduates, discussions of interlibrary loan and union catalogs should not be included.

Although seven texts examined here briefly discuss interlibrary loan and four briefly discuss union catalogs (three limiting the discussion to the *National Union Catalog*), none stress their use. However, the same argument advanced by some of these authors for including information about online searching and databases may apply here: the existence of interlibrary loan and union catalogs should be pointed out for potential future use.

In addition, what the Washington state survey suggests about the

abilities--and weaknesses--of incoming freshmen students should be kept in mind. Based upon its findings, writers of freshman English texts might be advised to include extended discussions on how to evaluate information, how to distinguish between primary and secondary sources and between popular and scholarly literature, how to interpret the information in periodical index citations and in bibliographic records, how to recognize different types of citations (book, periodical, government document, etc), and how to develop a search strategy--all skills or competencies which the librarians surveyed believed fewer than half of incoming freshmen possessed.

Perhaps so few of the texts examined here realize her goals because only a few appear to have been prepared, as she suggested, through "collaboration between authors of freshman English textbooks and library instruction librarians" (504). In their preface or list of acknowledgements, only six texts (Fergensen, Kennedy, McCrimmon, O'Hare, Tibbetts, Watkins) indicate the assistance or collaboration of librarians in the preparation of their library sections; another, Horner, acknowledges assistance, but doesn't identify the source of this help. Significantly, of the 25 texts examined, these contain some of the better sections on libraries.

Since so few texts met her criteria, Tiefel advised freshman English instructors seeking to "compensate for the inadequacy of the library chapters in current textbooks" that their " best course of action is to work with a librarian to develop a program and materials that will fit the objectives of the course. If a librarian is not available, the English instructor can outline a program based on the important concepts of library instruction" (503). Based on the findings of this study, that advice may still apply today.

## APPENDIX A


Bridges, Charles W., and Ronald F. Lunsford. *Writing: Discovering Form and Meaning*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1984.

Brown, Daniel, and Bill Burnette. *Connections: A Rhetoric/Short Prose Reader*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Crews, Frederick, and Sandra Schor. *The Borzoi Handbook for Writers*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

D'Angelo, Frank J. *Process and Thought in Composition*. 3rd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1985.

Dornan, Edward A., and Charles W. Dawe. *The Brief English Handbook*. 3rd ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education, 1990.

Fergensen, Laraine. *Writing with Style: Rhetoric, Reader, Handbook*. Fort Worth, Ind.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1989.

Glorfeld, Louis E., David A. Lauerman, and Norman C. Stageberg. *A Concise Guide for Writers*. 6th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Gould, Eric. *Reading into Writing: A Rhetoric, Reader, and Handbook*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983.

Hodges, John C., Mary C. Whitten, Winifred B. Horner, Suzanne S. Webb, and Robert K. Miller. *Harbrace College Handbook*. 11th ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990.

Horner, Winifred Bryan. *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Kane, Thomas S. *The Oxford Guide to Writing: A Rhetoric and Handbook for College Students*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Kennedy, X.J., and Dorothy M. Kennedy. *The Bedford Guide for College Writers with Readings and Handbook*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Langan, John. *English Skills*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Lannon, John M. *The Writing Process: A Concise Rhetoric*. 3rd ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1989.

Lauer, Janice M., Gene Montague, Andrea Lunsford, and Janet Emig. *Four Worlds of Writing*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

Leggett, Glenn, C. David Mead, and Melinda G. Kramer. *Prentice Hall Handbook for Writers.* 10th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Robert Connors. *The St. Martin's Handbook.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

McCrimmon, James A. *Writing with a Purpose.* 8th edition by Joseph F. Trimmer and Nancy I. Sommers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

O'Hare, Frank. *The Modern Writer's Handbook.* 2nd ed. New York: MacMillan, 1989.

Parker, John F. *The Independent Writer.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986.

Perrin, Robert. *The Beacon Handbook.* 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.

Robey, Cora L., Alice M. Hedrick, and Ethelyn H. Morgan. *New Handbook of Basic Writing Skills.* 2nd ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984.

Tibbetts, A.M., and Charlene Tibbetts. *Strategies of Rhetoric with Handbook.* 5th ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1987.

Watkins, Floyd C., and William B. Dillingham. *Practical English Handbook.* 8th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989.

Winkler, Anthony C., and Jo Ray McCuen. *Rhetoric Made Plain.* 4th ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984.

## APPENDIX B

Appendix B lists works by author, short title, and indicates the total pages in the book, the number of pages in the section devoted to the library, and the percentage of the library section to the total book.

| Author | Short Title | Total Pages in Book | Number of Pages in Library Section | Percentage of Library Section to Total Book |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bridges | *Writing* | 399 | 1 | 0.25% |
| Brown | *Rhetoric* | 339 | 2 | 0.6% |
| Crews | *Borzoi* | 591 | 17 | 2.8% |
| D'Angelo | *Process* | 609 | 9 | 1.5% |
| Dornan | *Brief* | 482 | 9 | 1.9% |
| Fergensen | *Writing* | 659 | 11 | 1.7% |
| Glorfeld | *Concise* | 227 | 4 | 1.8% |
| Gould | *Reading* | 695 | 7 | 1.0% |
| Hodges | *Harbrace* | 600 | 13 | 2.2% |
| Horner | *Rhetoric* | 462 | 13 | 2.8% |
| Kane | *Oxford* | 820 | 19* | 2.3% |
| Kennedy | *Bedford* | 819 | 21 | 2.6% |
| Langan | *English* | 428 | 9 | 2.1% |
| Lannon | *Writing* | 504 | 13 | 2.6% |
| Lauer | *Four* | 537 | 7 | 1.3% |
| Leggett | *Prentice Hall* | 590 | 20 | 3.4% |
| Lunsford | *St. Martin's* | 797 | 12 | 1.5% |
| McCrimmon | *Writing* | 752 | 20 | 2.7% |
| O'Hare | *Modern* | 549 | 15 | 2.7% |
| Parker | *Independent* | 782 | 5 | 0.6% |
| Perrin | *Beacon* | 708 | 15 | 2.1% |
| Robey | *New Handbook* | 442 | 6 | 1.4% |
| Tibbetts | *Strategies* | 613 | 32# | 5.2% |
| Watkins | *Practical* | 473 | 12 | 2.5% |
| Winkler | *Rhetoric* | 455 | 20 | 4.4% |

*Kane's text also contains an eight-page section on a sample research project which incorporates some discussion of library usage.

#Tibbett's section on libraries includes about 11 pages on note-taking, etc.

## APPENDIX C

Appendix C lists works by author and short title, and indicates the number of libraries reporting holding copies in OCLC. (Note: No attempt was made to determine the number of libraries holding earlier editions of texts with multiple editions.)

| Author | Short Title | Number of Libraries |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | *Writing* | 57 |
| Brown | *Rhetoric* | 37 |
| Crews | *Borzoi* | 184 |
| D'Angelo | *Process* | 56 |
| Dornan | *Brief* | 25 |
| Fergensen | *Writing* | 15 |
| Glorfeld | *Concise* | 76 |
| Gould | *Reading* | 62 |
| Hodges | *Harbrace* | 150 |
| Horner | *Rhetoric* | 52 |
| Kane | *Oxford* | 327 |
| Kennedy | *Bedford* | 13 |
| Langan | *English* | 66 |
| Lannon | *Writing* | 22 |
| Lauer | *Four* | 58 |
| Leggett | *Prentice Hall* | 203 |
| Lunsford | *St. Martin's* | 468 |
| McCrimmon | *Writing* | 234 |
| O'Hare | *Modern* | 25 |
| Parker | *Independent* | 29 |
| Perrin | *Beacon* | 19 |
| Robey | *New Handbook* | 24 |
| Tibbetts | *Strategies* | 30 |
| Watkins | *Practical* | 64 |
| Winkler | *Rhetoric* | 59 |

## ENDNOTES

[1]Virginia Tiefel, "Libraries and Librarians as Depicted in Freshman English Textbooks," *College English* 44 (September 1982): 500. (Subsequent references to this article will be made parenthetically).

[2]Mary M. Nofsinger, "Library Use Skills for College-Bound High School Students: A Survey," *The Reference Librarian* 24 (1989): 51.

[3]Karen Greenberg and Paula Mark, "Integrating Library Research Skills into the Basic Course Curriculum," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Atlantic City, N.J., April 30-May 3, 1986, ERIC, ED273896.

[4]Dan Ream, "Library Skills Instruction Found in Freshman English Textbooks at the University of Tennessee," *Tennessee Librarian* 38 (Summer 1986): 23.

[5]Daniel Brown and Bill Burnette, *Connections: A Rhetoric/Short Prose Reader* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1984), 21. (All subsequent references to the primary texts will be made parenthetically. See Appendix A for full citations for these texts.)

[6]Colleen Coghlan Amundson, "Relationship between University Freshmen's Information-Gathering Techniques and Selected Environmental Factors" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1971); *Dissertation Abstracts International* 32 (November 1971): 2718A.

[7]Nofsinger, 53.

[8]Nofsinger, 53.

[9]Nofsinger, 53.

[10]Nofsinger, 53.

[11]Nofsinger, 53.

[12]Nofsinger, 53.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amundson, Colleen Coghlan. "Relationship between University Freshmen's Information-Gathering Techniques and Selected Environmental Factors." (Ph.D. diss, University of Michigan, 1977) {DAI 32 (December 1971): 2718A.}

Greenberg, Karen, and Paula Mark. "Integrating Library Research Skills into the Basic Course Curriculum." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Atlantic City, N.J., April 30-May 3, 1986. ERIC, ED273996.

Nofsinger, Mary M. "Library Use Skills for College-Bound High School Students: A Survey." *The Reference Librarian* 24 (1989): 35-56.

Ream, Dan. "Library Skills Instruction Found in Freshman English Textbooks at the University of Tennessee." *Tennessee Librarian* 38 (Summer 1986): 19-23.

Tiefel, Virginia. "Libraries and Librarians as Depicted in Freshman English Textbooks." *College English* 44 (September 1982): 494-504.